arXiv:1610.05860v1 [math.RT] 19 Oct 2016

SEMIBRICKS

SOTA ASAI

Abstract. In representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras, the notion of (semi)bricks, generalizing (semi)simple modules, is classical. The aim of this paper is to study semibricks from a point of view of τ-tilting theory. We construct canonical bijections between the set of support τ-tilting modules, the set of semibricks satisfying a certain finiteness condition, and the 2-term simple-minded collections. In particular, we unify König–Yang bijections and Ingalls–Thomas bijections generalized by Marks–Šťovíček, which deal with several important notions in the module category and the derived category.

Contents

0. Introduction 1
1. Semibricks and support τ-tilting modules 5
2. Semibricks and 2-term simple-minded collections 11
3. Wide subcategories 16
4. Wide subcategories for tilted algebras 20
References 25

0. Introduction

In representation theory of a finite-dimensional algebra A over a field K, the notion of (semi)simple modules is basic. By Schur's Lemma, they satisfy the following properties;

- the endomorphism ring of a simple module is a division algebra,
- there exists no nonzero morphism between two nonisomorphic simple modules.

A module M in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *brick* if its endomorphism ring is a division algebra. This notion generalizing simple modules has been studied in representation theory [Rin, Gab1, Gab2]. Typical examples of bricks are given by preprojective modules and preinjective modules over a finite-dimensional hereditary algebra. It is useful to consider sets of isoclasses of pairwise Hom-orthogonal bricks, which we simply call *semibricks*. It follows from a classical result by Ringel [Rin] that the semibricks $\mathcal{S}$ correspond bijectively to the wide subcategories $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, that is, subcategories closed under taking kernels, cokernels, and extensions. In this correspondence, $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of the simple objects in $\mathcal{W}$, and $\mathcal{W}$ consists of all the A-modules filtered by bricks in $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, bricks and wide subcategories have close relationship with ring epimorphisms and universal localizations [Ste, Sch, GL].

In this paper, we assign a condition for semibricks. We say that a semibrick $\mathcal{S}$ is *left finite* if the minimal torsion class $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ containing $\mathcal{S}$ is functorially finite. We write $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ for the set of left finite semibricks. Dually, right finite semibricks and the set $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ are also defined. We define left-finiteness and right-finiteness of wide subcategories in the same way as semibricks. We write $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ (resp. $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$) for the set of left (resp. right) finite wide subcategories of

Date: October 20, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16G10 (primary), 16E35, 16S90 (secondary).
Key words and phrases. bricks; support τ-tilting modules; torsion classes; wide subcategories; simple-minded collections; silting objects; t-structures.

$\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Clearly, Ringel's bijection is restricted to a bijection between $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ and a bijection between $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$.

Recently, Adachi–Iyama–Reiten [AIR] obtained a bijection from the set $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ of basic *support τ-tilting modules* in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ to the set $\mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ of functorially finite torsion classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ by sending M to $\mathsf{Fac}\, M$. Support τ-tilting modules are a generalization of tilting modules and defined by the Auslander–Reiten translation τ. Adachi–Iyama–Reiten also proved that there is an operation called *mutations* of support τ-tilting modules, that is, constructing a new support τ-tilting module by changing one indecomposable direct summand of a given one. They showed that such mutations are nothing but the adjacency relations with respect to the inclusions of the corresponding torsion classes.

The following first main result shows that the support τ-tilting modules also bijectively correspond to the left finite semibricks, where $\mathsf{ind}\, N$ denotes the set of isoclasses of indecomposable direct summands of N. This is a large extension of [DIJ].

Theorem 0.1 (Theorem 1.3)**.** *There is a bijection* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ *given by* $M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$*, with* $B := \mathsf{End}_A(M)$*.*

For example, this map sends the progenerator A to the set of simple A-modules. As the first application of Theorem 0.1, we obtain a bijection $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$, see Proposition 1.8. As a consequence, we recover the Marks-Šťovíček bijection between $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ [MS]. As another consequence of Theorem 0.1, we also have the following result.

Corollary 0.2 (Corollary 1.9)**.** *If a semibrick $\mathcal{S}$ is either left finite or right finite, then $\#\mathcal{S} \leq n_A$ holds, where n_A is the number of isoclasses of simple A-modules.*

We use the map in Theorem 0.1 to define the labelling of the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ by bricks, which is a map from the set of the arrows in the exchange quiver to the set of bricks, see Definition 1.13.

Furthermore, we apply semibricks to study the derived category.

A *Simple-minded collection* in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is a set of isoclasses of objects in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ satisfying the conditions in Schur's Lemma with additional conditions, see Definition 2.1 for details. For our purpose, it is useful to consider simple-minded collections which are *2-term*, that is, the ith cohomology $H^i(X)$ of every object X in a simple-minded collection vanishes if $i \neq -1, 0$. A 2-term simple-minded collection in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ always consists of n_A objects, and each of them belongs to either $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ or $(\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$, see [KY, BY]. We write $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ for the set of 2-term simple-minded collections in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$. Our next main theorem gives bijections between $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$, $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$, and $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$.

Theorem 0.3 (Theorem 2.3 (1))**.** *There are bijections*

$$?\cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A, \quad ?[-1]\cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$$

given by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ *and* $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$*.*

As a consequence, a 2-term simple-minded collection in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is a union of a right finite semibrick shifted by [1] and a left finite semibrick.

In recent years, thanks to many authors such as [AIR, BY, IT, KY, MS], canonical bijections between the sets of important objects containing the following ones have been discovered, where, $\mathsf{proj}\, A$ (resp. $\mathsf{inj}\, A$) denotes the full subcategory of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ consisting of all projective (resp. injective) modules.

(a) The set $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ of left finite semibricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(a') The set $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ of right finite semibricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(b) The set $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ of isoclasses of basic support τ-tilting A-modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(b') The set $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ of isoclasses of basic support τ^{-1}-tilting A-modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(c) The set $\mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ of functorially finite torsion classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(c') The set $\mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ of functorially finite torsion-free classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

(d) The set $\mathsf{f_L}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ of left finite wide subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(d') The set $\mathsf{f_R}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ of right finite wide subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.
(e) The set $\mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{smc}\, A$ of 2-term simple-minded collections in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$.
(f) The set $\mathsf{int}\text{-}\mathsf{t}\text{-}\mathsf{str}\, A$ of intermediate t-structures with length heart in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$.
(g) The set $\mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{silt}\, A$ of 2-term silting objects in $\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$.
(g') The set $\mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{cosilt}\, A$ of 2-term cosilting objects in $\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$.

Figure 1 shows some of the known bijections and our new bijections (arrows with labels in rectangles). We prove the following result.

Theorem 0.4 (Theorem 2.3 (2)). *The diagram in Figure 1 is commutative and all the maps are bijective.*



FIGURE 1. The commutative diagram

Section 3 is devoted to further study of wide subcategories. Our aim in this section is describing every left finite wide subcategory $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ as the module category $\mathsf{mod}\, A'$ of some finite-dimensional algebra A'. Using $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $P \in \mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{silt}\, A$ corresponding to $\mathcal{W}$, we obtain K-algebras $B = \mathsf{End}_A(M)$ and $C = \mathsf{End}_{\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)}(P)$, whose module categories are realized in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$. We note that there are a surjection $\varphi\colon C \to B$ of K-algebras, and hence a fully faithful functor $\mathsf{mod}\, B \to \mathsf{mod}\, C$. The following result shows that we can regard $\mathcal{W}$ naturally as $\mathsf{mod}\, B/\langle e\rangle$ and $\mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f\rangle$ given by certain explicit idempotents $e \in B$ and $f \in C$.

Theorem 0.5 (Theorem 3.9). *The following diagram is commutative up to isomorphisms of functors, where $e \in B$ and $f \in C$ are some idempotents;*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)} & \mathsf{mod}\, B/\langle e\rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, B \\
\| & & \cong\downarrow\varphi & & \downarrow\varphi \\
\mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P,?)} & \mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f\rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, C\ .
\end{array}$$

Section 4 deals with functorially finiteness of wide subcategories for tilted algebras. We write $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ for the set of functorially finite wide subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. If A is hereditary, then $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ coincides with $\mathsf{f_L}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ [IT]. For an arbitrary algebra A, the inclusion $\mathsf{f_L}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A \subseteq \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$ holds [MS], but we give an example where the equality does not hold (Example 4.5). More strongly, we prove the following result.

Theorem 0.6 (Theorem 4.6)**.** *Let H be a hereditary algebra, $T \in \mathsf{mod}\, H$ be a tilting module, and $A = \mathsf{End}_H(T)$. We decompose T as $T_{\mathrm{pp}} \oplus T_{\mathrm{reg}} \oplus T_{\mathrm{pi}}$ with a preprojective module T_{pp}, a regular module T_{reg}, and a preinjective module T_{pi}. Then the following assertions hold.*

(1) *If $T_{\mathrm{pi}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$, and if $T_{\mathrm{pp}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{R}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$.*
(2) *If A is a concealed algebra, then we have $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{R}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$.*
(3) *Assume that H is a hereditary algebra of extended Dynkin type. If $T_{\mathrm{reg}} \neq 0$ and $T_{\mathrm{pi}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A \supsetneq \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{R}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$, and if $T_{\mathrm{reg}} \neq 0$ and $T_{\mathrm{pp}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A \supsetneq \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$.*

If H is a hereditary algebra of extended Dynkin type, we have the following table. Note that there never exists a regular tilting H-module and that A is representation-finite in the last case, see [SimS].

T_{pp}	T_{reg}	T_{pi}	$\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$	$\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A = \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{R}}\text{-}\mathsf{wide}\, A$
$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	YES	YES
$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	YES	YES
$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	YES	NO
$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	NO	YES
$\neq 0$		$\neq 0$	YES	YES

Acknowledgements. The author is a Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16J02249.

The author thanks to his supervisor Osamu Iyama for kind instructions. He also thanks to Laurent Demonet and Jan Šťovíček for valuable discussions.

Notations. We use the symbol "$\subset$" as the meaning of "$\subseteq$". The composition of maps or functors $f\colon X \to Y$ and $g\colon Y \to Z$ is denoted by gf.

Throughout of this paper, K is a field and A is a finite-dimensional K-algebra. The category of finite-dimensional right A-modules is denoted by $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, and its full subcategory consisting of all the projective (resp. injective) A-modules is denoted by $\mathsf{proj}\, A$ (resp. $\mathsf{inj}\, A$). Unless otherwise stated, algebras and modules are finite-dimensional, and subcategories are full subcategories. The bounded derived category of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ is denoted by $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$, and the homotopy category of the complex category over $\mathsf{proj}\, A$ (resp. $\mathsf{inj}\, A$) is denoted by $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ (resp. $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$).

For a full subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$, we define full subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ as follows;

- the subcategory $\mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{C}$ is the additive closure of $\mathcal{C}$,
- the subcategory $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{C}$ consists of the factor modules of objects in $\mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{C}$,
- the subcategory $\mathsf{Sub}\, \mathcal{C}$ consists of the submodules of objects in $\mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{C}$,
- the subcategory $\mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{C}$ consists of the objects X such that there exists a sequence $0 = X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \cdots \subset X_n = X$ with $X_i/X_{i-1} \in \mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{C}$.

If the set of objects of $\mathcal{C}$ is a finite set $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$, then we write $\mathsf{add}(M_1, \ldots, M_n)$ for $\mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{C}$, and similarly for other full subcategories. In order to emphasize the algebra A, we sometimes use the notations such as $\mathsf{add}_A\, \mathcal{C}$.

For $M \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$, the symbol $\mathsf{ind}\, M$ denotes the set of isoclasses of indecomposable direct summands of M, and we set $|M| := \#(\mathsf{ind}\, M)$. If $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i^{n_i}$ with M_i indecomposable, $M_i \ncong M_j$, and $n_i \geq 1$, then $\mathsf{ind}\, M = \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ and $|M| = m$ hold.

For $a \in A$, the symbol $\langle a \rangle$ denotes the two-sided ideal of A generated by a. The functor D is the K-dual $\mathsf{Hom}_K(?, K)$.

We often identify an object and its isoclass.

1. Semibricks and support τ-tilting modules

In this section, we deal with sets of pairwise Hom-orthogonal bricks, called semibricks, and bijections between semibricks and other concepts in the module category, especially *support τ-tilting modules*.

1.1. **Bijections.** We first recall the definition of bricks, and give the definition of semibricks.

Definition 1.1. We define as follows.

(1) An A-module S in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *brick* if $\mathsf{End}_A(S)$ is a division K-algebra.
(2) A set $\mathcal{S}$ of isoclasses of bricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *semibrick* if $\mathsf{Hom}_A(S_1, S_2) = 0$ holds for any $S_1 \neq S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. We write $\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ for the set of semibricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

By Schur's Lemma, it is clear that a simple A-module is a brick, and that a set of isoclasses of simple A-modules is a semibrick.

Note that we allow a semibrick to be an infinite set. This occurs, for example, in the case of the Kronecker quiver algebra. If there is an infinite semibrick in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, then any subset of the semibrick is also a semibrick by definition, so there are uncountablly many semibricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. We mainly consider the semibricks satisfying some conditions on torsion pairs. Each of such semibrick has $|A|$ elements at most, see Corollary 1.9.

A full subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *torsion class* if $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under extensions and factor modules, and a full subcategory $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *torsion-free class* if $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under extensions and submodules. We define $\mathsf{tors}\, A$ as the set of torsion classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ and $\mathsf{torf}\, A$ as the set of torsion-free classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. For a torsion class $\mathcal{T}$, the corresponding torsion pair is $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^{\perp})$, where $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} = \{M \in \mathsf{mod}\, A \mid \mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, M) = 0\}$, and for a torsion-free class $\mathcal{F}$, the corresponding torsion pair is $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$, where ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{F} = \{M \in \mathsf{mod}\, A \mid \mathsf{Hom}_A(M, \mathcal{F}) = 0\}$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$ be a full subcategory. We write $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{C})$ for the smallest torsion class containing $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathsf{F}(\mathcal{C})$ for the smallest torsion-free class containing $\mathcal{C}$. It is well-known that $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{C})$ and $\mathsf{F}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Sub}\, \mathcal{C})$, see [MS, Lemma 3.1].

We mainly consider functorially finite torsion classes and torsion-free classes. We write $\mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ for the set of functorially finite torsion classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ for the set of functorially finite torsion-free classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. By [Sma, Theorem], for a torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ holds if and only if $\mathcal{F} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$.

Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$. The semibrick $\mathcal{S}$ is called *left finite* (resp. *right finite*) if $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. $\mathsf{F}(\mathcal{S})$) is functorially finite. We write $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ (resp. $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$) for the set of left finite (resp. right finite) semibricks in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

One may wonder whether a subset of a left finite semibrick is left finite again. It does not hold in general, see Example 4.5.

We recall the concept of support τ-tilting modules, which is introduced by Adachi–Iyama–Reiten [AIR]. Let $M \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$ and $P \in \mathsf{proj}\, A$, then the A-module M is said to be *τ-rigid* if M satisfies $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, \tau M) = 0$ for the Auslander–Reiten translation τ, and the pair (M, P) is called a *τ-rigid pair* if M is τ-rigid and $\mathsf{Hom}_A(P, M) = 0$. We write $\tau\text{-}\mathsf{rigid}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of basic τ-rigid modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, here M is said to be *basic* if M can be decomposed into $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i$ with M_i indecomposable and $M_i \ncong M_j$ for $i \neq j$.

Assume that (M, P) is a τ-rigid pair. We say that (M, P) is a *support τ-tilting pair* if $|M| + |P| = |A|$, and that (M, P) is an *almost support τ-tilting pair* if $|M| + |P| = |A| - 1$. An A-module M is called a *support τ-tilting module* if there exists $P \in \mathsf{proj}\, A$ such that (M, P) is a support τ-tilting pair. We write $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of basic support τ-tilting modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, and we use both notations $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $(M, P) \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$.

Dually, the concepts of τ^{-1}-rigid modules and support τ^{-1}-tilting modules are also defined. We write $\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{rigid}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of basic τ^{-1}-rigid modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of basic support τ^{-1}-tilting modules in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

Now we are ready to state our first main theorem, which gives a large extension of a bijection given in [DIJ, Theorem 6.1]. Our theorem gives a bijection between the support τ-tilting modules and the left finite semibricks and the dual bijection.

Theorem 1.3. *We have the following maps, where $B := \mathsf{End}_A(M)$ in each case.*

(1) *There exists a surjection τ-$\mathsf{rigid}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ defined as $M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$.*
(2) *There exists a bijection $\mathsf{s}\tau$-$\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ defined as $M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$.*
(3) *There exists a surjection τ^{-1}-$\mathsf{rigid}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ defined as $M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_B M)$.*
(4) *There exists a bijection $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}$-$\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ defined as $M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_B M)$.*

Note that, for $M \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$ with $B = \mathsf{End}_A(M)$, we can rewrite $\mathsf{rad}_B M$ and $\mathsf{soc}_B M$ as follows;

$$\mathsf{rad}_B M = \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M,M)} \mathsf{Im}\, f, \quad \mathsf{soc}_B M = \bigcap_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M,M)} \mathsf{Ker}\, f.$$

In the rest of this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $M \in \tau$-$\mathsf{rigid}\, A$ and $B = \mathsf{End}_A M$. Then we have the following.*

(1) *The A-module $M/\mathsf{rad}_B M$ is basic and $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M) \in \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$.*
(2) *The torsion class $\mathsf{T}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$ is equal to $\mathsf{Fac}\, M$.*
(3) *We have $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M) \in \mathsf{f_L}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$.*

Proof. Let $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m M_i$ with M_i indecomposable. Because M is basic, $M_i \ncong M_j$ holds for $i \neq j$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, set

$$L_i := \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f \subset M_i, \quad N_i := M_i/L_i, \quad L := \bigoplus_{i=1}^m L_i, \quad N := \bigoplus_{i=1}^m N_i.$$

It is easy to see that $N = M/\mathsf{rad}_B M$. Note that $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M, L) = 0$ holds because $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ and M is τ-rigid. We have $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M_i, L_j) = 0$ for all i, j.

(1) First, we show that N_i is a brick or zero for each i. It is sufficient to show that any nonzero endomorphism $f\colon N_i \to N_i$ is an isomorphism. Consider the exact sequence $0 \to L_i \xrightarrow{\mu_i} M_i \xrightarrow{\pi_i} N_i \to 0$. By $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M_i, L_i) = 0$, we obtain that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i, \pi_i)$ is surjective. There exists $g\colon M_i \to M_i$ such that $\pi_i g = f \pi_i$. Because $f \neq 0$, g is an isomorphism (otherwise, we have $\mathsf{Im}\, g \subset L_i$ and thus $f = 0$, a contradiction). Therefore, f is also an isomorphism. We have shown that N_i is a brick or zero.

Second, we show $\mathsf{Hom}_A(N_i, N_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$. Let $f\colon N_i \to N_j$. Consider the exact sequence $0 \to L_j \xrightarrow{\mu_j} M_j \xrightarrow{\pi_j} N_j \to 0$. By $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M_i, L_j) = 0$, it follows that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i, \pi_j)$ is surjective again. There exists $g\colon M_i \to M_j$ such that $\pi_j g = f \pi_i$. Because $M_i \ncong M_j$, we have $\mathsf{Im}\, g \subset L_j$ and $f = 0$. We have shown that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(N_i, N_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

We obtained that N is basic and that $\mathsf{ind}\, N = \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M) \in \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$.

(2) Since M is τ-rigid, $\mathsf{Fac}\, M$ is a torsion class [AS2, Theorem 5.10]. Thus $\mathsf{T}(N) \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ is easy. On the other hand, to prove $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \subset \mathsf{T}(N)$, it is sufficient to see that $M \in \mathsf{T}(N)$. There exist $f_1, \dots, f_s\colon M \to M$ such that $\mathsf{rad}\, B = \mathsf{Im}\, f_1 + \cdots + \mathsf{Im}\, f_s$. Put $f := \begin{bmatrix} f_1 & \cdots & f_s \end{bmatrix} : M^s \to M$. We have $f((\mathsf{rad}^t_B M)^{\oplus s}) = \mathsf{rad}^{t+1}_B M$ for all $t \geq 0$, and therefore $\mathsf{rad}^{t+1}_B M/\mathsf{rad}^{t+2}_B M \in \mathsf{Fac}(\mathsf{rad}^t_B M/\mathsf{rad}^{t+1}_B M)$. By induction, we have $\mathsf{rad}^t_B M/\mathsf{rad}^{t+1}_B M \in \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, there exists t_0 such that $\mathsf{rad}^t_B M = 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Then the sequence $M \supset \mathsf{rad}_B M \supset \cdots \supset \mathsf{rad}^{t_0}_B M = 0$ shows $M \in \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, N) = \mathsf{T}(N)$. Thus $\mathsf{T}(N) = \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ has been proved.

(3) By [AS1, Proposition 4.6], the torsion class $\mathsf{Fac}\, M$ is functorially finite. Therefore, the semibrick $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$ belongs to $\mathsf{f_L}$-$\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ by (2). □

We recall an important property of support τ-tilting modules in [AIR], which associates the support τ-tilting modules and the functorially finite torsion classes bijectively.

Proposition 1.5. [AIR, Theorem 2.7] *There exists a bijection* $\mathsf{Fac}\colon \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ *defined as* $M \mapsto \mathsf{Fac}\, M$. *The inverse* $\mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A \to \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *is given by sending each* $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ *to the direct sum of indecomposable Ext-projective objects in* $\mathcal{T}$.

By Lemma 1.4, we have the following commutative diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{Fac}} & \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A & \xleftarrow{\mathsf{T}} & \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A\,. \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M) & & \end{array}$$

To show Theorem 1.3, we observe the operation $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ taking the minimal torsion class. If it is injective, the above diagram and Proposition 1.5 imply Theorem 1.3. The following property is an analogue of Schur's Lemma.

Lemma 1.6. *Let* $\mathcal{S}$ *be a semibrick and* $S \in \mathcal{S}$. *Then every nonzero morphism* $f\colon M \to S$ *with* $M \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ *is surjective.*

Proof. Since $M \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{S})$, there exists a sequence $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_{l-1} \subset M_l = M$ with $M_i/M_{i-1} \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{S}$. We can take $k = \min\{i \mid f(M_i) \neq 0\}$ because $f \neq 0$. Then f induces a nonzero map $\tilde{f} \neq 0\colon M_k/M_{k-1} \to S$. Since $M_k/M_{k-1} \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{S}$, there exists a surjection $g\colon N \to M_k/M_{k-1}$ with $N \in \mathsf{add}\, \mathcal{S}$, and we have a nonzero map $\tilde{f}g \neq 0\colon N \to S$. Then there exists an indecomposable direct summand S_1 of N such that $(\tilde{f}g)|_{S_1} \neq 0\colon S_1 \to S$. It is clear that S_1 is a brick in $\mathcal{S}$, and $(\tilde{f}g)|_{S_1}\colon S_1 \to S$ is isomorphic because $\mathcal{S}$ is a semibrick. Thus $\tilde{f}$ is surjective, and so is f. □

Lemma 1.7. *The map* $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{tors}\, A$ *is injective. Moreover, it is restricted to an injection* $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ satisfy $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_1) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_2)$.

We show $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_2$. Let $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. By $S_1 \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_1) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_2) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, S_2)$, there exists a nonzero map $f\colon S_2 \to S_1$ with $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Because $S_2 \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_2) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}_1)$, Lemma 1.6 implies that f is surjective. Similarly, we have a surjection $g\colon S_1' \to S_2$ with $S_1' \in \mathcal{S}_1$. We can see that $fg\colon S_1' \to S_1$ is surjective, and because $\mathcal{S}_1$ is a semibrick, fg is isomorphic. Since g is surjective, f is isomorphic. Thus we have $S_1 \cong S_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Now we have proved that $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_2$.

By symmetry, we also obtain $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{S}_1$, and $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2$ is proved. This implies the injectivity.

The restriction is well-defined and injective by definition. □

Now we can show Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We prove (1) and (2). The parts (3) and (4) are the duals.

The maps in (1) and (2) are well-defined by Lemma 1.4.

We also have $\mathsf{T}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M) = \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ by Lemma 1.4. By Lemma 1.7, $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ is injective, and by Proposition 1.5, the map $\mathsf{Fac}\colon \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ is bijective. Thus the map in (2) is bijective, and hence the map in (1) is surjective. □

In the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have the following.

Proposition 1.8. *The following conditions hold.*

(1) *The map* $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A$ *is a bijection, and we have the following commutative diagrams of bijections;*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{Fac}} & \mathsf{f}\text{-}\mathsf{tors}\, A & \xleftarrow{\mathsf{T}} & \mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{L}}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A\,. \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M) & & \end{array}$$

(2) *The map* $\mathsf{F}\colon \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ *is a bijection, and we have the following commutative diagrams of bijections;*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{Sub}} & \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A & \xleftarrow{\mathsf{F}} & \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A\,. \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & M\mapsto \mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_B M) & & \end{array}$$

Proof. We only prove (1), because (2) is the dual.

It is already shown that the diagram is commutative. Now the maps $\mathsf{Fac}\colon \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \ni M \mapsto \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M) \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ are bijective. Thus the map $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ is also bijective. □

Therefore, the functorially finite torsion classes in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ correspond bijectively not only to the support τ-tilting modules, which are in the "projective" side, but also to the left finite semibricks, which are in the "simple" side, and these are connected by the map in Theorem 1.3.

We have the next corollary on the cardinalities of semibricks.

Corollary 1.9. *If* $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ *is either left finite or right finite, then* $\#\mathcal{S} \leq |A|$ *holds.*

Proof. We argue the left finite case. The other case is similar.

For $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, we have $|M/\mathsf{rad}_B M| \leq |M|$ in the first part of the proof of Lemma 1.4 (1), and by the definition of support τ-tilting modules, $|M| \leq |A|$ holds. With Theorem 1.3, the assertion is obtained. □

1.2. **Labelling the exchange quiver by bricks.** The map in Theorem 1.3 gives us a way of labelling the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ by bricks, that is, to label each arrow with a brick. Here, the exchange quiver is the quiver expressing the *mutations*.

We briefly recall the definition of mutations on $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ in [AIR, Definition 2.19]. Let $(M,P),(N,Q) \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$. If there exists an almost support τ-tilting pair which is a common direct summand of (M,P) and (N,Q), then we say that (N,Q) is a *mutation* of (M,P). By [AIR, Theorem 2.18], for each direct summand L of M or P, there uniquely exists a mutation of (M,P) at L. If N is a mutation of M, then exactly one of $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \supsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ or $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \subsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ holds. If $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \supsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$, then N is called a *left mutation* of M, and otherwise N is called a *right mutation* of M.

The exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ is a quiver with its vertices the elements of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, and there is an arrow from M to N if and only if N is a left mutation of M. For any vertex M, the number of arrows which are either from or to M is always $|A|$.

The following lemma is important, and will be used later.

Lemma 1.10. [DIJ, Example 3.5] *If* N *is a left mutation of* M *in* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$*, then there exists no torsion class* $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{tors}\, A$ *satisfying* $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \supsetneq \mathcal{T} \supsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$.

We dually define mutations in $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$. Assume that N is a mutation of M in $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$. We call N is a left mutation of M if $\mathsf{Sub}\, M \subsetneq \mathsf{Sub}\, N$ and a right mutation of M if $\mathsf{Sub}\, M \supsetneq \mathsf{Sub}\, N$.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ [AIR, Theorem 2.15]. This is given as follows; for $(M,P) \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, decompose $M = M_{\mathrm{np}} \oplus M_{\mathrm{pr}}$ so that M_{np} has no nonzero projective direct summand and M_{pr} is projective, then we associate $(\tau M_{\mathrm{np}} \oplus \nu P, \nu M_{\mathrm{pr}}) \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ to $(M,P) \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$.

Proposition 1.11. *The above bijection* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A \to \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *satisfies the following properties.*

(1) [AIR, Proposition 2.16] *If* $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *maps to* $M' \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$*, then* $(\mathsf{Fac}\, M, \mathsf{Sub}\, M')$ *is a torsion pair in* $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

(2) *Assume that* $M, N \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *map to* $M', N' \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *respectively. Then* N *is a left mutation of* M *in* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *if and only if* N' *is a left mutation of* M' *in* $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$.

(3) *The exchange quivers of* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *and* $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ *are isomorphic by this bijection.*

Proof. (2) is easy, because the above bijection preserves direct summands.
(3) is immediately deduced by (2). □

We need the following detail description of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 1.12. *Let $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and decompose M as $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i$ with M_i indecomposable. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, Define*

$$L_i := \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f, \quad N_i := M_i/L_i.$$

Then the following conditions are equivalent for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

(a) *The module N_i is a brick.*
(b) *The module N_i is nonzero.*
(c) *The module M_i is not in $\mathsf{Fac} \bigoplus_{j \neq i} M_j$.*
(d) *There exists a left mutation of M at M_i in $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$.*

Especially, the number of left mutations of M is equal to $|M/\mathsf{rad}_B M|$.

Proof. (a) and (b) are equivalent by the first part of the proof of Lemma 1.4 (1).
We show the equivalence of (b) and (c). For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, set $B_i = \mathsf{End}_A M_i$ and

$$L_i' := \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M_j, M_i),\ j \neq i} \mathsf{Im}\, f, \quad L_i'' := \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M_i, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f.$$

They are B_i-A-subbimodules of M_i and satisfy $L_i = L_i' + L_i''$. We can see that (b) holds if and only if $L_i' + L_i'' \neq M_i$, and that (c) holds if and only if $L_i' \neq M_i$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $L_i' + L_i'' = M_i$ holds if and only if $L_i' = M_i$. Clearly, $L_i' = M_i$ implies $L_i' + L_i'' = M_i$. On the other hand, assume $L_i' + L_i'' = M_i$. Because $L_i'' = \mathsf{rad}_{B_i} M_i$, we have $L_i' = M_i$ by Nakayama's Lemma as left B_i-modules. Thus (b) and (c) are equivalent.
The equivalence of (c) and (d) is proved in [AIR, Definition-Proposition 2.28]. □

Definition 1.13. We define the labelling of the exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ by bricks as follows.

(1) Let $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and decompose M as $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i$ with M_i indecomposable. Assume that $M \to N$ is an arrow in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, and that N is the left mutation of M at M_i. Then we label this arrow with a brick $M_i/\sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f$.
(2) Let $N' \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and decompose N' as $N' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} N_i'$ with N_i' indecomposable. Assume that $M' \to N'$ is an arrow in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, and that M' is the right mutation of N' at N_i'. Then we label this arrow with a brick $\bigcap_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(N_i', N')} \mathsf{Ker}\, f$.

Recall that there is a bijection between $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ (see Proposition 1.11). Actually, the two definitions of labelling coincide under this bijection.

Theorem 1.14. *The bijection between $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ preserves the labellings of the exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ by bricks.*

The above theorem is proved by the following proposition characterizing the labelling of the exchange quiver by bricks.

Proposition 1.15. *Assume that $M \to N$ is an arrow in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ labelled with a brick S, and that $M, N \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ correspond to $M', N' \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ respectively.*

(1) *The brick S belongs to $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$.*
(2) *If $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ and $L \neq 0$, then there exists a surjection $L \to S$.*
(3) *The arrow $M' \to N'$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ is also labelled with S.*
(4) *If L is a brick in $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$, then we have $L \cong S$.*
(5) *The subcategory $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ coincides with $\mathsf{Filt}\, S$.*

Proof. (1) Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$ with $B = \mathsf{End}_A(M)$. It is clear that $S \in \mathcal{S}$, so we have $S \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$.

Next we show that $S \notin \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. There exists an indecomposable direct summand M_1 of M such that N is the left mutation of M at M_1. We decompose M as $M_1 \oplus M_2$, then we obtain $\mathsf{Fac}\, M_2 = \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. Moreover, any $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $S_1 \neq S$ satisfies $S_1 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M_2 = \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. Thus, if $S \in \mathsf{Fac}\, N$, then we have $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. By Lemma 1.4, it means that $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, N$, a contradiction. Therefore, $S \notin \mathsf{Fac}\, N$.

To prove $S \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$, it is sufficient to show that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(N, S) = 0$ by Proposition 1.11. Let $f\colon N \to S$. It is easy to see $N \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}$. By Lemma 1.6, f is 0 or surjective. Since $S \notin \mathsf{Fac}\, N$, we have $f = 0$. Therefore, we have $S \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$.

Now S belongs to $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$.

(2) We show that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(L, S) \neq 0$. Because $L \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ and $L \neq 0$, we get $L \notin \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ by Proposition 1.11. Thus we have $\mathsf{T}(L, N) \supsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. By the assumption $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$, we also have $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \supset \mathsf{T}(L, N) \supsetneq \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. By Lemma 1.10, $\mathsf{T}(L, N)$ must coincide with $\mathsf{Fac}\, M$. By the proof of (1), we have $\mathsf{Hom}_A(N, S) = 0$, so if $\mathsf{Hom}_A(L, S) = 0$, the equality $\mathsf{T}(L, N) = \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ implies $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathsf{Fac}\, M, S) = 0$. This is false, because $S \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$ and $S \neq 0$. Thus we have $\mathsf{Hom}_A(L, S) \neq 0$.

Thus there exists a nonzero map $f\colon L \to S$. We have $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}$. By Lemma 1.6, f is surjective.

(3) Let S' be the brick labelled on the arrow $M' \to N'$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, and $\mathcal{S}' = \mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_{B'} N')$ with $B' = \mathsf{End}_A(N')$. The dual of (1) implies that $S' \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$, so there exists a surjection $f\colon S' \to S$ by (2). By assumption, $S \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N' = \mathsf{F}(\mathcal{S}')$ and $S' \in \mathcal{S}'$. Using the dual of Lemma 1.6, we obtain that f is injective. Thus f is an isomorphism, and we have $S' \cong S$.

(4) By (3) and the dual of (2), there also exists an injection $g\colon S \to L$. Composing a surjection $f\colon L \to S$ obtained by (2), we have a nonzero endomorphism $gf\colon L \to L$. Because L is a brick, gf is an isomorphism, and hence g and f are isomorphisms. Therefore, we get $L \cong S$.

(5) It is clear that $\mathsf{Filt}\, S \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$.

We must show that $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N' \subset \mathsf{Filt}\, S$. Let $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$. If $L = 0$, then $L \in \mathsf{Filt}\, S$. Thus we assume $L \neq 0$, and we use the induction on $\mathsf{dim}_K L$. By the dual of (2), there exist an injection $f\colon S \to L$.

If $\mathsf{dim}_K L = \mathsf{dim}_K S$, then we have $L \cong S \in \mathsf{Filt}\, S$.

If $\mathsf{dim}_K L > \mathsf{dim}_K S$, we show that $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$. If it is shown, we have $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Filt}\, S$ by the induction hypothesis and hence $L \in \mathsf{Filt}\, S$. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$.

On the other hand, $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathsf{Fac}\, N, \mathsf{Coker}\, f) = 0$ by Proposition 1.11. We decompose M as $M_1 \oplus M_2$ as in the proof of (1), then we have $\mathsf{Fac}\, N = \mathsf{Fac}\, M_2$. Thus $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_2, \mathsf{Coker}\, f) = 0$ implies $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathsf{Fac}\, N, \mathsf{Coker}\, f) = 0$. By a short exact sequence $0 \to S \to L \to \mathsf{Coker}\, f \to 0$, we have an exact sequence $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_2, L) \to \mathsf{Hom}_A(M_2, \mathsf{Coker}\, f) \to \mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M_2, S)$. Since $L \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$, we have $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathsf{Fac}\, N, L) = 0$ and $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_2, L) = 0$. Next, since M_2 is a direct summand of M and $S \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M$, we obtain $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(M_2, S) = 0$. Consequently, $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_2, \mathsf{Coker}\, f) = 0$ is deduced. We have $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$.

Therefore, $\mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ is proved, and $L \in \mathsf{Filt}\, S$ is obtained.

Now the induction process has been completed. □

We remark that $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N' = \mathsf{Filt}\, S$ in Proposition 1.15 is a *wide subcategory* of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, see Section 3.

Labelling of the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ by bricks is originally considered as *layer labelling* in the case that A is a preprojective algebra of Dynkin type Δ by Iyama–Reading–Reiten–Todorov [IRRT]. The definition of their layer labelling uses the bijection between $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and the Coxeter group of Δ given by Mizuno [Miz, Theorem 2.21], so it is rather different from the definition of our labelling. However, for the preprojective algebras of Dynkin type, layers are

precisely bricks, and the layer on each arrow $M \to N$ belongs to $\mathsf{Fac}\, M \cap \mathsf{Sub}\, N'$ in Proposition 1.15 [IRRT, Theorem 4.1]. Therefore, the layer labelling completely coincides with our labelling.

Example 1.16. Let A be the path algebra of the quiver $1 \to 2 \to 3$. The exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ with labelling by bricks are Figure 2. The bricks in $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M) \in \mathsf{f_L}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ for each $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and the bricks in $\mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_B\, M) \in \mathsf{f_R}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ for each element in $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ is denoted by red letters.



FIGURE 2. The exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$

2. SEMIBRICKS AND 2-TERM SIMPLE-MINDED COLLECTIONS

In this section, we deal with 2-term simple-minded collections in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ to understand more properties of left finite or right finite semibricks.

2.1. **Bijections.**

First, we give the definition of 2-term simple-minded collection in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$.

Definition 2.1. A set $\mathcal{X}$ of isomorphic classes of objects in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is called a *simple-minded collection* in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ if it satisfies the following conditions;

- for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathsf{End}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X)$ is a division K-algebra,

- for any $X_1 \neq X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X_1, X_2) = 0$,
- for any $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n < 0$, we have $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X_1, X_2[n]) = 0$,
- the smallest thick subcategory of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ containing $\mathcal{X}$ is $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ itself.

A simple-minded collection $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is said to be *2-term* if the ith cohomology $H^i(X)$ is 0 for any $i \neq -1, 0$ and any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We write $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ for the set of 2-term simple-minded collections in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$.

Remark 2.2. Every $\mathcal{X} \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ satisfies $\#\mathcal{X} = |A|$ by [KY, Lemma 3.3], and every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ belongs to either $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ or $(\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$ up to isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$, see Lemma 2.7 (1).

The following is the main theorem of this section. It means that every 2-term simple-minded collection is divided into a left finite semibrick and a right finite semibrick, and there are bijections between these three concepts.

Theorem 2.3. *We have the following bijections.*

(1) *There are bijections*

$$?\cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon\ \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A, \quad ?[-1]\cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon\ \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$$

given by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ *and* $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$.

(2) *The diagram in Figure 3 is commutative and all the maps are bijective.*



FIGURE 3. The commutative diagram

To prove this theorem, we use the notions and basic properties on 2-term silting objects in the homotopy category $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ and intermediate t-structures in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$. We refer to [BY, KY] here.

An object $P \in \mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ is called a *silting object* in $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ if the following conditions are satisfied;

- for any $n > 0$, $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)}(P, P[n]) = 0$,
- the smallest thick subcategory of $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ containing P is $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ itself.

A silting object P in $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ is said to be *2-term* if it is isomorphic to some $(P^{-1} \to P^0)$ in $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ with its components zero except for -1st and 0th ones. We write $\mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of basic 2-term silting objects in $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$.

We dually define the 2-term cosilting objects in $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$ and write $\mathsf{2\text{-}cosilt}\, A$ for the set of isoclasses of ones. The Nakayama functor $\nu\colon \mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A) \to \mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$ induces a bijection from $\mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$ to $\mathsf{2\text{-}cosilt}\, A$. There is a formula called the Nakayama duality; $D\,\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, X) \cong \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X, \nu P)$ for $P \in \mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ and $X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$.

We next recall the notion of intermediate t-structures.

The concept of t-structures is introduced by Beĭlinson–Bernstein–Deligne [BBD]. First, let $\mathcal{D}$ be a triangulated category and $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$ be a pair of additive full subcategories of $\mathcal{D}$. For simplicity, we define $\mathcal{D}^{\leq n} := \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}[-n]$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\geq n} := \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}[-n]$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The pair $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$ is called a *t-structure* in $\mathcal{D}$ if it satisfies the following conditions;

- we have $\mathcal{D}^{\leq -1} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\geq 1} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}$, and $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 1}) = 0$,
- for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a triangle $Y \to X \to Z \to Y[1]$ in $\mathcal{D}$ with $Y \in \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{D}^{\geq 1}$.

In this case, it is easy to see that each of $\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}$ determines the other. For a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$ in $\mathcal{D}$, the intersection $\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}$ is called the *heart* of the t-structure. It is well-known that the heart is an abelian category [BBD].

If $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$, there is a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}_{\mathrm{std}}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}_{\mathrm{std}})$ in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ defined by cohomologies, namely,

$$\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}_{\mathrm{std}} = \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid H^i(X) = 0 \ (i > 0)\},$$
$$\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}_{\mathrm{std}} = \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid H^i(X) = 0 \ (i < 0)\},$$

and it is called the *standard t-structure* in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$. We say a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$ in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is *intermediate* with respect to the standard t-structure (or simply *intermediate*) if $\mathcal{D}^{\leq -1}_{\mathrm{std}} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}_{\mathrm{std}}$, or equivalently, $\mathcal{D}^{\geq -1}_{\mathrm{std}} \supset \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0} \supset \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}_{\mathrm{std}}$ holds. We can see that every intermediate t-structure $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$ in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is *bounded*, that is,

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}^{\leq n} = \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}^{\geq n}$$

holds. In this paper, we only consider the intermediate t-structures in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ such that its heart is an abelian category with length, and the set of ones is denoted by $\mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A$.

The following is an important result by Brüstle–Yang [BY] on these concepts, and it is a "2-term" restrictions of König–Yang bijections [KY, Theorem 6.1].

Proposition 2.4. [BY, Corollary 4.3] *We have the following bijections.*

(1) *There is a bijection* $\mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A \to \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A$ *given by* $P \mapsto (P[>0]^{\perp}, P[<0]^{\perp})$*, where*

$$\begin{aligned} P[>0]^{\perp} &= \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, X[n]) = 0 \ (n > 0)\} \\ &= \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X, \nu P[n]) = 0 \ (n < 0)\} = {}^{\perp}(\nu P)[<0], \\ P[<0]^{\perp} &= \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, X[n]) = 0 \ (n < 0)\} \\ &= \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(X, \nu P[n]) = 0 \ (n > 0)\} = {}^{\perp}(\nu P)[>0]. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *There is a bijection* $\mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A \to \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ *defined as follows; for* $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}) \in \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A$*, we associate the isoclasses of simple objects in the heart* $\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}$*.*

Note that the heart of the corresponding intermediate t-structure $(P[>0]^{\perp}, P[<0]^{\perp})$ for $P \in \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$ is

$$P[\neq 0]^{\perp} = \{X \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \mid \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, X[n]) = 0 \ (n \neq 0)\}.$$

It will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proposition 2.4 gives bijections on objects or collections of $\mathsf{K}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ and $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$, but we also would like to know their relationship with concepts in the module category. Here, we cite [AIR, BY].

Proposition 2.5. [AIR, Theorem 3.2] *The map* $\mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A \ni P \mapsto H^0(P) \in \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$ *is bijective. The inverse is given as follows; for* $(M, P) \in \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$ *with the minimal projective resolution* $P^{-1} \to P^0 \to M \to 0$*, we associate* $(P^{-1} \oplus P \to P^0) \in \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$*.*

Proposition 2.6. [BY, Theorem 4.9] *We have a bijection* $(\text{heart})\cap\mathsf{mod}\, A\colon \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ *defined by* $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}) \mapsto \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$*, and this bijection joins the following commutative diagram of bijections;*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A & \xrightarrow{P\mapsto (P[>0]^{\perp}, P[<0]^{\perp})} & \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A & \xrightarrow{\text{simples of heart}} & \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle H^0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\text{heart})\cap\mathsf{mod}\, A} & & \\ \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{Fac}} & \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A & & \end{array} .$$

In Proposition 2.6, we can easily see that $\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A = \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ by the definition of intermediate t-structures, and the original statement in [BY] uses the latter.

Now we start the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $P \in \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$ *and* $\mathcal{H} = P^{\perp_{\neq 0}}$ *be the heart of the corresponding t-structure.*

(1) [BY, Remark 4.11] *Let* X *be an object in* $\mathcal{H}$*. Then* $H^{-1}(X)[1]$ *and* $H^0(X)$ *are also in* $\mathcal{H}$*, and there exists an exact sequence* $0 \to H^{-1}(X)[1] \to X \to H^0(X) \to 0$ *in* $\mathcal{H}$*, where* $H^i\colon \mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A) \to \mathsf{mod}\, A$ *is the functor taking the* i*th cohomology with respect to* $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ *as usual. Especially, if* X *is a simple object in* $\mathcal{H}$*, then in* $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$*,* X *is isomorphic to an object in* $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ *or* $(\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$*.*

(2) *We have* $H^0(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$*.*

(3) *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be the set of isoclasses of simple objects in* $\mathcal{H}$*, and* $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ *as in Theorem 2.3. Then we have* $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$*. Moreover,* $\mathcal{S}$ *belongs to* $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$*.*

Proof. (2) It is easily deduced by (1).

(3) We first prove that $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$. Because $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ is a torsion class in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ by Proposition 2.6, it is sufficient to see that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$. This is clear.

Now we show the converse $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A \subset \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$. By (2), it is enough to show $H^0(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$, or equivalently, $H^0(X) \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ for all $X \in \mathcal{H}$. We use the induction on the length l of X in the abelian category $\mathcal{H}$ with length.

If $l = 0$, then $X \cong 0$, so $H^0(X) = 0 \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$.

If $l \geq 1$, there exists a short exact sequence $0 \to Y \to X \to Z \to 0$ in $\mathcal{H}$ with Y simple and Z of length $l - 1$. By (1), we may assume that Y belongs to $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ or $(\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$. By the induction hypothesis, we can see $H^0(Z) \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$. The short exact sequence is lifted to a triangle $Y \to X \to Z \to Y[1]$.

In case $Y \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$, we have $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ and an exact sequence $Y \to H^0(X) \to H^0(Z) \to 0$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Set $M = \mathsf{Ker}(H^0(X) \to H^0(Z))$, then we get $M \in \mathsf{Fac}\, Y \subset \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$. Because there is a short exact sequence $0 \to M \to H^0(X) \to H^0(Z) \to 0$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ with $H^0(Z) \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$, the module $H^0(X)$ is also in $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$.

In case $Y \in (\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$, we have an exact sequence $0 \to H^0(X) \to H^0(Z) \to 0$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Thus we have $H^0(X) \cong H^0(Z)$ and $H^0(X) \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$.

The induction is completed, and we have $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$.

It is obvious that $\mathcal{S}$ is a semibrick, and $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{H} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ is functorially finite by Proposition 2.6. These mean $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, the map $? \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ is well-defined, and this diagram is commutative;

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A & \xrightarrow{P\mapsto (P[>0]^{\perp}, P[<0]^{\perp})} & \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A & \xrightarrow{\text{simples of heart}} & \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle H^0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\text{heart})\cap\mathsf{mod}\, A} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle ?\cap\mathsf{mod}\, A} \\ \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{Fac}} & \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A & \xleftarrow{\mathsf{T}} & \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A \end{array} .$$

Because the other maps in this diagram are bijective by Propositions 1.8 and 2.6, so the map $? \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon\ \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ is bijective.

The remained statement is obtained by the duals, the Nakayama duality, and Theorem 1.3. □

As in Lemma 2.7, the map $(\text{heart}) \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon\ \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ equals to $H^0(\text{heart})$, and dually, the map $(\text{heart})[-1] \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A\colon\ \mathsf{int\text{-}t\text{-}str}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ equals to $H^{-1}(\text{heart})$. Moreover, Lemma 2.7 (1) says that every 2-term simple-minded collection in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ consist of isoclasses of objects in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ and $(\mathsf{mod}\, A)[1]$. Therefore in Theorem 2.3 (2), we can regard the bottom row as the 0th cohomologies of the middle(-lower) row, and the top row as the -1st cohomologies of the middle(-upper) row.

On the other hand, the next proposition focuses on the columns of the diagram in Theorem 2.3 (2).

Proposition 2.8. *In Theorem 2.3 (2), the following hold.*

(1) *Let $(M,P) \in \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$. Decompose $M = M_{\mathrm{np}} \oplus M_{\mathrm{pr}}$ so that M_{np} has no nonzero projective direct summand and that M_{pr} is projective. Then (M,P) corresponds to $(\tau M_{\mathrm{np}} \oplus \nu P, \nu M_{\mathrm{pr}}) \in \mathsf{s\tau^{-1}\text{-}tilt}\, A$.*

(2) *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$. Then $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ corresponds to $\mathcal{F} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ if and only if $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.*

(3) *Let $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ and $\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ correspond to $\mathcal{X} \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$. Then $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'[1] = \mathcal{X}$ and $\#\mathcal{S} + \#\mathcal{S}' = \#\mathcal{X} = |A|$.*

Proof. (1) Let $P^{-1} \to P^0 \to M_{\mathrm{np}} \to 0$ be the minimal projective presentation of M_{np}. By [AIR, Theorem 3.2], $(M,P) \in \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$ corresponds to $(P^{-1} \to P^0) \oplus (0 \to M_{\mathrm{pr}}) \oplus (P \to 0) \in \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$, where the right terms are the 0th terms. This is sent to $(\nu P^{-1} \to \nu P^0) \oplus (0 \to \nu M_{\mathrm{pr}}) \oplus (\nu P \to 0) \in \mathsf{2\text{-}cosilt}\, A$ by the Nakayama functor ν. Taking -1st cohomology, we have $(\tau M_{\mathrm{np}} \oplus \nu P, \nu M_{\mathrm{pr}}) \in \mathsf{s\tau^{-1}\text{-}tilt}\, A$ by the remark after [AIR, Theorem 2.15].

(2) It is deduced by (1) and [AIR, Proposition 2.16].

(3) See Remark 2.2 and Lemma 2.7. □

It follows that the correspondence between $\mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s\tau^{-1}\text{-}tilt}\, A$ in Theorem 2.3 is the same one given before Proposition 1.11.

2.2. **Labelling the exchange quiver by bricks.** We can rewrite left mutations in $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ in [BY] as follows in order to induce the mutations in $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$. Any $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ can be uniquely completed to an element of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ by Theorem 2.3. Though it is not easy to find the complement $\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ such that $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'[1] \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$, once it is found, then the left mutations in $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ is calculated easily.

Proposition 2.9. [BY, Subsection 3.7] *Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$.*

(1) *Assume $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a left mutation of $\mathcal{X}$ at X in $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ if and only if $X \in \mathcal{S}$.*

(2) *For $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, a left mutation of $\mathcal{X}$ at S_0 is uniquely given as follows;*
- *define the full subcategory $\mathcal{E} := \mathsf{Filt}\, S_0$ of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$,*
- *set $Y_{S_0} := S_0[1]$,*
- *for any $S \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{S_0\}$, consider a left minimal $\mathcal{E}$-approximation $f_S\colon S[-1] \to E_S$ with $E_S \in \mathcal{E}$ in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ and define Y_S as the mapping cone of f_S (we can see $Y_S \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$ and have an exact sequence $0 \to E_S \to Y_S \to S \to 0$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$),*
- *for any $S'[1] \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{S}$, consider a left minimal $\mathcal{E}$-approximation $f_{S'[1]}\colon S' \to E_{S'[1]}$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. If $f_{S'[1]}$ is injective, then set $Y_{S'[1]} := \mathsf{Coker}\, f_{S'[1]}$, and otherwise (in this case $f_{S'[1]}$ is surjective), set $Y_{S'[1]} := (\mathsf{Ker}\, f_{S'[1]})[1]$,*
- *now $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_X \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is the left mutation of $\mathcal{X}$ at S_0.*

We define the labelling of the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ by bricks as follows.

Definition 2.10. In the setting of Proposition 2.9, we label the arrow $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ with a brick S_0.

Right mutations in $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ at each object in $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$ are similarly defined. By definition, the labels on the arrows from $\mathcal{X}$ are the elements of $\mathcal{S}$, and the labels on the arrows to $\mathcal{X}$ are the elements of $\mathcal{S}'$.

We give an example, compare with Example 1.16.

Example 2.11. Let A be the path algebra of the quiver $1 \to 2 \to 3$. The exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ with labelling by bricks is Figure 4.



FIGURE 4. The exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$

The three exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, and $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ in Examples 1.16 and 2.11 are naturally isomorphic by the maps in Theorem 2.3. This holds for an arbitrary finite dimensional K-algebra [BY, Corollary 4.3, Theorem 4.9]. Now we show that the maps in Theorem 2.3 also preserve the labellings of the exchange quivers by bricks.

Proposition 2.12. *The maps in Theorem 2.3 preserve the labellings of the exchange quivers of* $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$, *and* $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ *by bricks.*

Proof. We prove the assertion for $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$. The assertion for $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ is the dual.

Let $M, N \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ correspond to $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ respectively, and assume that N is the mutation of M at M_i. The arrow $M \to N$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ is labelled by a brick $S := M_i / \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f$. By Theorem 1.3, S is in a semibrick $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B M)$ with $B := \mathsf{End}_A(M)$. By Theorem 2.3, we have $S \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A$. By definition, there exists exactly one arrow from $\mathcal{X}$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ labelled with S. Let this arrow be $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Z}$ and $L \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$ correspond to $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$. It is obvious that $S[1] \in \mathcal{Z}$ and hence $S \in \mathcal{F}$ by Theorem 2.3. By Proposition 2.8, $(\mathsf{Fac}\, L, \mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Thus L is a left mutation of M with $S \notin \mathsf{Fac}\, L$. Such L is unique and must be N. Now we have $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z}$ and that the arrow $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ in the exchange quiver of $\mathsf{2\text{-}smc}\, A$ is labelled with a brick S. □

3. WIDE SUBCATEGORIES

In this section, we deal with wide subcategories of the module category $\mathsf{mod}\, A$, which are strongly related to semibricks.

Definition 3.1. A full subcategory $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$ is called a *wide subcategory* if $\mathcal{W}$ is a subcategory and closed under kernels, cokernels, and extensions of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. We write $\mathsf{wide}\, A$ for the set of wide subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

The following important result is deduced by [Rin, 1.2].

Proposition 3.2. *The operation* $\mathsf{Filt}\colon \mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{wide}\, A$ *is a bijection, and its inverse* $\mathsf{wide}\, A \to \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ *sends* $\mathcal{W} \in \mathsf{wide}\, A$ *to the set of isoclasses of simple objects in* $\mathcal{W}$.

It is easy to see that if $\mathcal{S}$ is a semibrick and $\mathcal{W} = \mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{S}$ is the corresponding wide subcategory, then the torsion classes $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W})$ coincide. Thus we can define left finiteness and right finiteness for wide subcategories as in the case of semibricks. We write $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ for the set of left finite wide subcategories, and dually the set $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$ is defined. It is clear that the map $\mathsf{Filt}\colon \mathsf{sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{wide}\, A$ in Proposition 3.2 is restricted to bijections $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$.

Marks–Šťovíček investigated relationship between wide subcategories and torsion classes. Lemma 1.7 and Proposition 1.8 recover the following proposition in some sense. We define $\mathsf{W_L}\colon \mathsf{tors}\, A \to \mathsf{wide}\, A$ by $\mathsf{W_L}(\mathcal{T}) = \{M \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{For any } f\colon L \to M \text{ in } \mathcal{T},\ \mathsf{Ker}\, f \in \mathcal{T}\}$ and $\mathsf{W_R}\colon \mathsf{torf}\, A \to \mathsf{wide}\, A$ by $\mathsf{W_R}(\mathcal{F}) = \{M \in \mathcal{F} \mid \text{For any } f\colon M \to N \text{ in } \mathcal{F},\ \mathsf{Coker}\, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Proposition 3.3. *The operation* T *satisfies the following properties.*

1. [MS, Proposition 3.3] *The composition* $\mathsf{W_L} \circ \mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{wide}\, A \to \mathsf{wide}\, A$ *is identity, and especially, the map* $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{wide}\, A \to \mathsf{tors}\, A$ *is injective.*
2. [MS, Theorem 3.10] *The map* $\mathsf{T}\colon \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A \to \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$ *is bijective. The inverse is given by* $\mathsf{W_L}\colon \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$.

Combining with Propositions 1.5 and 1.8, we have the next proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *We have the following commutative diagrams of bijections;*





From now on, we assume that $P \in \mathsf{2\text{-}silt}\, A$ and set $C := \mathsf{End}_{\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)}(P)$. The K-algebra C is isomorphic to $C' := \mathsf{End}_{\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)}(\nu P)$ by the Nakayama functor $\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{proj}\, A) \to \mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$. It is well-known that the heart $\mathcal{H} = P[\neq 0]^{\perp}$ of the corresponding t-structure $(P[>0]^{\perp}, P[<0]^{\perp})$ in $\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{mod}\, C$, by the functor $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, ?)\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C$. This is proved using non-positive dg algebras, see [KY, Subsection 4.2]. Dually, we have an equivalence $D\, \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(?, \nu P)\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C'$.

We also define as

$$M' := H^{-1}(\nu P), \qquad M := H^0(P),$$
$$B' := \mathsf{End}_A(M'), \qquad B := \mathsf{End}_A(M),$$
$$\mathcal{S}' := \mathsf{ind}(\mathsf{soc}_{B'}\, M'), \qquad \mathcal{S} := \mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M).$$

By Theorems 1.3 and 2.3, we have $\mathcal{S}' \in \mathsf{f_R}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$ and $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{f_L}\text{-}\mathsf{sbrick}\, A$, and by Proposition 2.8, we get $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'[1] \in \mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{smc}\, A$. Let $P_1, \dots, P_n$ be the indecomposable direct summands of P, where $n = |A|$ by [KY, Corollary 5.1]. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, we set

$$M_i' := H^{-1}(\nu P_i), \qquad M_i := H^0(P_i),$$
$$N_i' := \bigcap_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M_i', M')} \mathsf{Ker}\, f, \qquad N_i := M_i / \sum_{f \in \mathsf{rad}_A(M, M_i)} \mathsf{Im}\, f.$$

We have seen that N_i is indecomposable or zero in the first part of the proof of Lemma 1.4 (1). Dually, N_i' is indecomposable or zero. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}' = \{N_i' \mid N_i' \neq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{N_i \mid N_i \neq 0\}$.

Lemma 3.5. *In the setting above, the following assertions hold for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

(1) *The module M_i is projective if and only if $M_i' = 0$.*
(2) *We have $N_i \neq 0$ if and only if $N_i' = 0$.*
(3) *We have $M_i \neq 0$ if and only if M_i' is not injective.*
(4) *If M_i is projective then $N_i \neq 0$, and if $N_i \neq 0$ then $M_i \neq 0$.*

Proof. (1), (3) and (4) are obvious.

(2) Because $\#\mathcal{S} + \#\mathcal{S}' = n$ by [KY, Lemma 3.3], it is sufficient to show that $N_i \neq 0$ implies $N_i' = 0$. Assume $N_i \neq 0$ and $N_i' \neq 0$.

Because N_i and $N_i'[1]$ are in $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'[1] \in \mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{smc}\, A$, they are simple in $\mathcal{H}$ by Theorem 2.3. On the other hand, $N_i \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M_i$ implies $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P_i, N_i) \neq 0$, and $N_i' \in \mathsf{Sub}\, M_i'$ implies $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(N_i'[1], \nu P_i') \neq 0$. By the Nakayama duality, we have $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P_i, N_i) \neq 0$ and $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P_i, N_i'[1]) \neq 0$.

Considering the equivalence $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, ?) \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C$, N_i and $N_i'[1]$ must be isomorphic in $\mathcal{H}$, because they are simple in $\mathcal{H}$. It is a contradiction. □

We have a bijection between the indecomposable direct summands of P and the elements of $\mathcal{X}$ as follows. See also [KY, Lemma 5.3].

Lemma 3.6. *For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $X_i = N_i$ if $N_i \neq 0$ and $X_i = N_i'[1]$ if $N_i' \neq 0$. Then we have $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ and $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P_i, X_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$.*

Proof. Because $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'[1]$, we have $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. Next, every X_i is simple in $\mathcal{H}$ and satisfies $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P_i, X_i) \neq 0$. Considering the equivalence $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, ?) \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C$, the assertion is easily deduced. □

By Lemma 3.5, we may assume that $P_1, \dots, P_n$ and $k \leq l \leq m$ satisfy the following conditions;

- M_i is projective if and only if $i = 1, \dots, k$,
- $N_i \neq 0$ holds if and only if $i = 1, \dots, l$,
- $M_i \neq 0$ holds if and only if $i = 1, \dots, m$.

In this case, we have

$$\mathcal{S} = \{N_1, \dots, N_l\}, \quad \mathcal{S}' = \{N_{l+1}', \dots, N_n'\}, \quad \mathcal{X} = \{N_1, \dots, N_l, N_{l+1}'[1], \dots, N_n'[1]\}.$$

The corresponding left finite wide subcategory is $\mathcal{W} = \mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{S}$, and the right finite wide subcategory is $\mathcal{W}' = \mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{S}'$.

We can see the two categories $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}'[1]$ as Serre subcategories of $\mathcal{H}$ by the next proposition. We define $f_i \in C$ as the idempotent endomorphism $P \to P_i \to P$ in $\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{proj}\, A)$ and set $f := f_{l+1} + \ldots + f_n$ for $P \in \mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{silt}\, A$. We also define $f_i' \in C'$ as the idempotent endomorphism $\nu P \to \nu P_i \to \nu P$ in $\mathsf{K^b}(\mathsf{inj}\, A)$ and set $f' := f_1' + \ldots + f_l'$ for $\nu P \in \mathsf{2}\text{-}\mathsf{cosilt}\, A$.

Proposition 3.7. *In the setting above, we have the following equivalences.*

(1) *The equivalence $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D^b}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, ?) \colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C$ is restricted to an equivalence $\mathcal{W} \cong \mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f \rangle$ of abelian categories.*

(2) *The equivalence* $D\,\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(?,\nu P)\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\,C'$ *is restricted to an equivalence* $\mathcal{W}'[1] \cong \mathsf{mod}\,C'/\langle f'\rangle$ *of abelian categories.*

Proof. We only prove (1). The part (2) is shown similarly. Let $X \in \mathcal{H}$.

A simple object X_i in $\mathcal{H}$ is not contained in the composition factors of X in $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(P_i, X) = 0$, which is deduced by an exact functor $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(P_i,?)\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\,K$ and Lemma 3.6. This is also equivalent to $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(P, X) \circ f_i = 0$.

The condition $X \in \mathcal{W}$ exactly means that none of $X_{l+1}, \dots, X_n$ are contained in the composition factors of X in $\mathcal{H}$. By the observation above, this holds if and only if $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(P, X) \circ f = 0$. Therefore, the equivalence $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\,A)}(P,?)\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathsf{mod}\,C$ is restricted to an equivalence $\mathcal{W} \cong \mathsf{mod}\,C/\langle f\rangle$. □

On the other hand, a support τ-tilting A-module M is a tilting $A/\mathsf{ann}\,M$-module. By Brenner–Butler's theorem, $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)\colon \mathsf{Fac}\,M \to \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ is an equivalence, and moreover, it is an equivalence of exact categories [DIJ, Proposition 3.2].

The following proposition gives a way to regard the wide subcategories $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'[1]$ as Serre subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\,B$ and $\mathsf{mod}\,B'$, respectively. We define $e_i \in B$ as the idempotent endomorphism $M \to M_i \to M$ and set $e := e_{l+1} + \cdots + e_m$ for $M \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\,A$. Dually, we define $e'_i \in B'$ as the idempotent endomorphism $M' \to M'_i \to M'$ and set $e' := e'_{k+1} + \cdots + e'_l$ for $M' \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\,A$.

Proposition 3.8. *For* $M = H^0(P) \in \mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\,A$ *and* $M' = H^{-1}(\nu P) \in \mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\,A$*, we have the following assertions.*

(1) *The equivalence* $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)\colon \mathsf{Fac}\,M \to \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ *sends the elements of* $\mathcal{S}$ *to the simple* B*-modules in* $\mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$*.*

(2) *The equivalence* $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)\colon \mathsf{Fac}\,M \to \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ *is restricted to an equivalence* $\mathcal{W} \cong \mathsf{mod}\,B/\langle e\rangle$ *of abelian categories.*

(3) *The equivalence* $D\,\mathsf{Hom}_A(?,M')\colon \mathsf{Sub}\,M' \to \mathsf{Fac}_{B'}\,DM'$ *sends the elements of* $\mathcal{S}'$ *to the simple* B'*-modules in* $\mathsf{Fac}_{B'}\,DM'$*.*

(4) *The equivalence* $D\,\mathsf{Hom}_A(?,M')\colon \mathsf{Sub}\,M' \to \mathsf{Fac}_{B'}\,DM'$ *is restricted to an equivalence* $\mathcal{W}' \cong \mathsf{mod}\,B'/\langle e'\rangle$ *of abelian categories.*

Proof. We only prove (1) and (2), because (3) and (4) are the duals.

(1) A quasi-inverse of $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)\colon \mathsf{Fac}\,M \to \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ is given by $? \otimes_B M\colon \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM \to \mathsf{Fac}\,M$. A simple B-module Z in $\mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ corresponds to $Z \otimes_B M \in \mathsf{Fac}\,M$, which is an indecomposable direct summand of $M/\mathsf{rad}_B\,M$. Thus we have $Z \otimes_B M \in \mathcal{S}$.

On the other hand, let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. We claim that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S)$ is a simple B-module. Because $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S) \neq 0$, there exists a simple B-module Z such that $\mathsf{Hom}_B(Z, \mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S)) \neq 0$. Because $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S) \in \mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$, the simple B-module Z also belongs to $\mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$. By the observation above, we have $Z \otimes_B M \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathsf{Hom}_A(Z \otimes_B M, S) \neq 0$. Because $Z \otimes_B M, S \in \mathcal{S}$, we obtain $S \cong Z \otimes_B M$. Therefore, $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S)$ is isomorphic to Z, and hence it is a simple B-module.

Now the assertion has been proved.

(2) The number of isoclasses of simple B-modules in $\mathsf{mod}\,B/\langle e\rangle$ is l. By (1), the simple B-modules in $\mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$ coincide with the objects in $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,\mathcal{S})$, and there are exactly $\#\mathcal{S} = l$ isoclasses of simple B-modules in $\mathsf{Sub}_B\,DM$. Thus it is enough to show that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathsf{mod}\,B/\langle e\rangle$.

Let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. We can take $j \in \{1,\dots,l\}$ such that $S = N_j$. We decompose M as $M_j \oplus M_{\neq j}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{S\} \subset \mathsf{Fac}\,M_{\neq j}$, so we have $\mathsf{T}(M_{\neq j}, S) = \mathsf{Fac}\,M$ because $\mathsf{Fac}\,M \supset \mathsf{T}(M_{\neq j}, S) \supset \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathsf{Fac}\,M$.

It is easy to see that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,S) \in \mathsf{mod}\,B/\langle e\rangle$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i,S) = 0$ for $i = l+1,\dots,m$. Assume that there exists $i \in \{l+1,\dots,m\}$ such that $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i,S) \neq 0$. The module M_i belongs to $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{S})$, so by Lemma 1.6, we have $S \in \mathsf{Fac}\,M_i$. This implies $\mathsf{Fac}\,M =$

$\mathsf{T}(M_{\neq j}, S) = \mathsf{T}(M_{\neq j}) = \mathsf{Fac}\, M_{\neq j}$. Especially, we have $M_j \in \mathsf{Fac}\, M_{\neq j}$, but it is a contradiction to Lemma 1.12, because $N_j = S \neq 0$. Thus $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i, S) = 0$ holds for $i = l+1, \ldots, m$. Now we have $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, \mathcal{S}) \subset \mathsf{mod}\, B/\langle e \rangle$. □

Now we relate the above two propositions. Note that there is an epimorphism $\varphi\colon C \to B$ of K-algebras defined by $g \mapsto H^0(g)$, which induces an epimorphism $\varphi\colon C/\langle f \rangle \to B/\langle e \rangle$. Dually, we have a K-algebra epimorphism $\varphi'\colon C' \to B'$ defined by $g \mapsto H^{-1}(g)$, which induces an epimorphism $\varphi'\colon C'/\langle f' \rangle \to B'/\langle e' \rangle$.

Theorem 3.9. *The following diagrams are commutative up to isomorphisms of functors;*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_A(M,?)} & \mathsf{mod}\, B/\langle e \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, B \\
\| & & \cong\downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow \varphi \\
\mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P,?)} & \mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, C\ ,
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{W}' & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_A(?,M')} & \mathsf{mod}\, B'/\langle e' \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, B' \\
\cong\downarrow [1] & & \cong\downarrow \varphi' & & \downarrow \varphi' \\
\mathcal{W}'[1] & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(?,\nu P)} & \mathsf{mod}\, C'/\langle f' \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} & \mathsf{mod}\, C'\ .
\end{array}$$

Especially, $\varphi\colon C/\langle f \rangle \to B/\langle e \rangle$ and $\varphi'\colon C'/\langle f' \rangle \to B'/\langle e' \rangle$ are isomorphisms.

Proof. We show the commutativity of the first diagram. The second one is the dual.

It is enough to show that the functor $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, ?)\colon \mathcal{W} \to \mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f \rangle$ is isomorphic to the following functor; for $X \in \mathcal{W}$, we associate $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X)$ regarded as an object in $\mathsf{mod}\, C$, where C acts on $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X)$ by $g \cdot h = g \circ H^0(h)$ for $g \in \mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X)$ and $h \in C$.

We consider a natural morphism $\pi\colon P \to M$ in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)$. By straightforward calculation, the map $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\pi, X)\colon \mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X) \to \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathsf{mod}\, A)}(P, X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{W}$ is an isomorphism of K-vector spaces functorial at X. If it is a functorial isomorphism of C-modules with the act of C on $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X)$ defined as above, then the assertion is proved. This is easily deduced by the formula $g \circ H^0(h) \circ \pi = g \circ \pi \circ h$ for $g \in \mathsf{Hom}_A(M, X)$ and $h \in C$.

Now we have proved that φ induces an equivalence between $\mathsf{mod}\, B/\langle e \rangle$ and $\mathsf{mod}\, C/\langle f \rangle$. Because $C/\langle f \rangle$ and $B/\langle e \rangle$ are basic algebras, it follows that $\varphi\colon C/\langle f \rangle \to B/\langle e \rangle$ is an isomorphism. □

4. Wide subcategories for tilted algebras

We deal with functorially finiteness of wide subcategories and semibricks in this section. We write $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$ for the set of functorially finite wide subcategories of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$.

For a given algebra A, we consider the following two conditions in this section.

Condition 4.1. [MS] The equality $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$ hold.

Condition 4.2. For any $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$, any subset of $\mathcal{S}$ belongs to $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$.

We recall the following results for Condition 4.1.

Proposition 4.3. *We have the following assertions.*

1. [IT, Proposition 2.13] *If A is hereditary, $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$ holds.*
2. [MS, Proposition 3.3, Lemma 3.8] *For an arbitrary algebra A, we have $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A \subset \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$ and $\mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A \subset \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$.*

We also note relationship between Conditions 4.1 and 4.2.

Proposition 4.4. *If $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$, then the algebra A satisfies Condition 4.2.*

Proof. Assume $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$ and let $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Set $\mathcal{W}_1 := \mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{W}_2 := \mathsf{Filt}\, \mathcal{S}_2$. By assumption, we have $\mathcal{W}_1 \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$, and Proposition 4.3 (2) implies that $\mathcal{W}_1 \in \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$.

There exists $M \in \mathsf{s\tau\text{-}tilt}\, A$ such that $\mathsf{ind}(M/\mathsf{rad}_B\, M) = \mathcal{S}_1$ by Theorem 1.3. By Proposition 3.8, we obtain an equivalence $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, ?) \colon \mathcal{W}_1 \to \mathsf{mod}\, B_1$ for some algebra B_1 sending the elements of $\mathcal{S}_1$ to the simple B_1 modules. Thus $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M, \mathcal{W}_2)$ is equivalent to a Serre subcategory of $\mathsf{mod}\, B_1$ and especially it is functorially finite in $\mathsf{mod}\, B_1$. This implies that $\mathcal{W}_2$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{W}_1$.

Because $\mathcal{W}_1$ belongs to $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$, $\mathcal{W}_2$ belongs to $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$. By assumption, we have $\mathcal{W}_2 \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$. Therefore, A satisfies Condition 4.2. □

Actually, the following example is a counterexample to both Conditions 4.1 and 4.2. In the rest, we assume that K is an algebraically closed field. For additive full subcategories $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathsf{mod}\, A$, the symbol $\mathcal{C}_1 * \mathcal{C}_2$ denotes the full subcategory of $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ consisting of all M's such that there exists a short exact sequence $0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0$ with $M_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $M_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$.

Example 4.5. Let A be the finite-dimensional K-algebra given by a quiver and a relation,

$$1 \underset{\beta}{\overset{\alpha}{\rightrightarrows}} 2 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 3\,, \quad \alpha\gamma = 0.$$

We write e_i for the corresponding idempotent for the vertex $i = 1, 2, 3$.

We consider an indecomposable injective module I_3;

$$I_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad I_3\alpha = 0, \quad I_3\beta = I_3 e_2.$$

First, I_3 is a brick, so it follows that $\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3 \in \mathsf{wide}\, A$ by Proposition 3.2. Because I_3 is injective, we have $\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3 = \mathsf{add}\, I_3$, and it is in $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$.

We show $\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3 \notin \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$, that is, $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3) = \mathsf{T}(I_3) \notin \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$. Assume $\mathsf{T}(I_3) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$. We consider the quotient algebra $A' := A/\langle e_3 \rangle$. The algebra A' is isomorphic to the path algebra of a Kronecker quiver $1 \rightrightarrows 2$. Let $M := I_3 \otimes_A A'$. Because $\mathsf{T}(I_3) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, I_3) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$, the torsion class $\mathsf{T}(M) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, M)$ must belong to $\mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A'$. We can see that M is a brick in $\mathsf{mod}\, A'$, because

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M\alpha = 0, \quad M\beta = Me_2,$$

so we have $\mathsf{Filt}\, M \in \mathsf{wide}\, A'$. Because $\mathsf{T}(M) = \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{Filt}\, M) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A'$, $\mathsf{Filt}\, M$ must be in $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A'$ by Proposition 4.3 (2). However, M is in a homogeneous tube in the Auslander–Reiten quiver of $\mathsf{mod}\, A'$, so we obtain $\mathsf{Filt}\, M \notin \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$, and it is a contradiction. Thus it has been shown that $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3) = \mathsf{T}(I_3) \notin \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$.

Condition 4.1 does not hold.

Moreover, we claim that $\mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A \neq \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$. To prove this, we show $\mathsf{Filt}\, I_3 \in \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$, that is, $\mathsf{F}(I_3) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$. We use the map $\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{rigid}\, A \to \mathsf{f_R\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ in Theorem 1.3. Clearly, I_3 is τ^{-1}-rigid and a brick. Thus the corresponding right finite semibrick is $\{I_3\}$, and we have $\mathsf{F}(I_3) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$.

For Condition 4.2, we consider a simple module S_2;

$$S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can see that I_3 and S_2 are pairwise orthogonal bricks, and we have shown that $\{I_3\} \notin \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$. To show that Condition 4.2 does not hold, it is sufficient to prove $\{I_3, S_2\} \in \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$, that is, $\mathsf{T}(I_3, S_2) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$. We use the map in $\tau\text{-}\mathsf{rigid}\, A \to \mathsf{f_L\text{-}sbrick}\, A$ in Theorem 1.3. Let P_1 be the following indecomposable projective module;

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & & 1 & & 2 \\ & 3 & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

By straightforward calculation, we obtain that $S_2 \oplus P_1$ is a τ-rigid A-module, and that the corresponding left finite semibrick is $\{I_3, S_2\}$. This implies that $\mathsf{T}(I_3, S_2) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$.

The algebra in Example 4.5 is a tilted algebra of type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_2$. The exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ are written in Figure 5.

As for Condition 4.1, we prove more general properties for tilted algebras.

Theorem 4.6. *Let H be a hereditary algebra, $T \in \mathsf{mod}\, H$ be a tilting module, and $A = \mathsf{End}_H(T)$. We decompose T as $T_{\mathrm{pp}} \oplus T_{\mathrm{reg}} \oplus T_{\mathrm{pi}}$ with a preprojective module T_{pp}, a regular module T_{reg}, and a preinjective module T_{pi}. Then the following assertions hold.*

1. *If $T_{\mathrm{pi}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$, and if $T_{\mathrm{pp}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$.*
2. *If A is a concealed algebra, then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$.*
3. *Assume that H is a hereditary algebra of extended Dynkin type. If $T_{\mathrm{reg}} \neq 0$ and $T_{\mathrm{pi}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A \supsetneq \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$, and if $T_{\mathrm{reg}} \neq 0$ and $T_{\mathrm{pp}} = 0$, then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A \supsetneq \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$.*

Now we begin the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a torsion pair in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ satisfying the following conditions;*

- *the torsion pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is splitting,*
- *for any $N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have $\mathsf{Ext}^2_A(N_1, N_2) = 0$,*
- *if $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{tors}\, A$ and $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{X}$, then we have $\mathcal{T} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$.*

Then we have $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A = \mathsf{f_L\text{-}wide}\, A$.

Proof. We note that $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(N, M) = 0$ holds for any $M \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $N \in \mathcal{Y}$, because the torsion pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is splitting.

Let $\mathcal{W} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$ and set $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} := \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{Y}$. It is sufficient to prove $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}tors}\, A$.

We first show that $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$ holds. Let L belong to $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. There exists a short exact sequence $0 \to L_1 \xrightarrow{f} L \xrightarrow{g} L_2 \to 0$ such that $L_1 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $L_2 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Because $L_2 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, there exists a surjection $h\colon N \to L_2$ with $N \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. We have $N \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $L_1 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{X}$, because $\mathcal{X}$ is a torsion class. Thus we have $\mathsf{Ext}^1_A(N, L_1) = 0$ and there exists $h'\colon N \to L$ such that $h = gh'$. We have the following commutative diagram with the rows exact;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & N & = & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h'} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & L & \xrightarrow{g} & L_2 & \longrightarrow & 0\,. \end{array}$$

We have exact sequences $L_1 \to \mathsf{Coker}\, h' \to 0$ and $0 \to N/\mathsf{Ker}\, h' \to L \to \mathsf{Coker}\, h' \to 0$. We can easily see that $N/\mathsf{Ker}\, h' \in \mathsf{Fac}\, N \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ and that $\mathsf{Coker}\, h' \in \mathsf{Fac}\, L_1 \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Thus we have $L \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Therefore $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$ holds.

By assumption, every indecomposable module in $\mathcal{W}$ belongs to $\mathcal{X}$ or $\mathcal{Y}$. Thus we have $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathsf{Filt}(\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Because $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}} * \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}$, we have $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}) * \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}})$. If $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}})$ are functorially finite, then $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W})$ is functorially finite, see [SikS, Theorem 2.6].

We would like to show the functorially finiteness of $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}})$.

We prove $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}) = \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by a similar argument to [IT, Proposition 2.13]. Let $0 \to L_1 \to L_2 \to L_3 \to 0$ be a short exact sequence with $L_1, L_3 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. It is sufficient to show that $L_2 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. By assumption, there exists a surjection $f_3\colon N_3 \to L_3$ with $N_3 \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Taking the



FIGURE 5. The exchange quivers of $\mathsf{s}\tau\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$ and $\mathsf{s}\tau^{-1}\text{-}\mathsf{tilt}\, A$

pull back, we have the following commutative diagram with the rows exact and f_2 surjective;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2' & \longrightarrow & N_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \| & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_3} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2 & \longrightarrow & L_3 & \longrightarrow & 0\,. \end{array}$$

By assumption again, there exists a surjection $g_1\colon N_1 \to L_1$ with $N_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$. Because $\mathcal{Y}$ is a torsion-free class, we have $\mathsf{Ker}\, g_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$. By assumption, we get $\mathsf{Ext}^2_A(N_3, \mathsf{Ker}\, g_1) = 0$ and the following commutative diagram with the rows exact and g_2 surjective;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2'' & \longrightarrow & N_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g_2} & & \| & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2' & \longrightarrow & N_3 & \longrightarrow & 0\,. \end{array}$$

Now we have $L_2'' \in \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$ because $\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$ is extension closed. Clearly, $f_2g_2\colon L_2'' \to L_2$ is surjective, so we have $L_2 \in \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$. We have proved $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}) = \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$.

We show that $\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$ is covariantly finite in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Let $L \in \mathsf{mod}\, A$. There exists a left $\mathcal{W}$-approximation $f\colon L \to M \oplus N$ with $M \in \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{X}$ and $N \in \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$, because $\mathcal{W}$ is functorially finite and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is splitting. Compose a projection $p\colon M \oplus N \to N$, then we have a left $\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$-approximation $pf\colon L \to N$, because $\mathsf{Hom}_A(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$ is covariantly finite.

Now we can take a left $\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}$-approximation $A \to N$. Then we get $N \in \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ and $\mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y} = \mathsf{Fac}\, N$. By [AS1, Proposition 4.6], $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}) = \mathsf{Fac}\, \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y} = \mathsf{Fac}\, N$ is functorially finite.

On the other hand, it is clear that $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{X})$ is contained in $\mathcal{X}$, so $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{X})$ is functorially finite by assumption.

We finally have $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{Y}) * \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{X})$ is functorially finite. □

We can show Theorem 4.6.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. (1) It is easy to see that the tilting H-module T induces a splitting torsion pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma 4.7. Note that $\mathcal{X}$ has only finitely many indecomposable A-modules and that $\mathcal{Y} = \mathsf{Sub}_A\, DT$.

(2) If A is a concealed algebra, in this situation, A can be obtained by not only some tilting module T with $T = T_{\mathrm{pp}}$ but also some tilting module T with $T = T_{\mathrm{pi}}$. Therefore, both of the statement of (1) and its dual can be applied.

(3) We refer to [SimS].

By assumption, there exists a regular stable tube $\mathcal{C}$ in the Auslander–Reiten quiver of $\mathsf{mod}\, H$ containing an indecomposable direct summand of T_{reg}. Let V be the direct sum of the indecomposable direct summands of T in $\mathcal{C}$, and decompose T as $U \oplus V$. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{Hom}_H(V, U) = 0$.

Now we define the *cone* for each indecomposable H-module in the stable tube $\mathcal{C}$. Let r be the rank of the stable tube $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{A}_\infty/\langle\tau^r\rangle$ as translation quivers. We may assume that the set of vertices of $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{A}_\infty/\langle\tau^r\rangle$ is $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\} \times (\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z})$, and that the set of arrows is

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(a, b + r\mathbb{Z}) \to (a + 1, b + r\mathbb{Z}) \mid a \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\},\ b \in \{0, \dots, r - 1\}\} \\ &\cup \{(a + 1, b + r\mathbb{Z}) \to (a, b + 1 + r\mathbb{Z}) \mid a \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\},\ b \in \{0, \dots, r - 1\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix an isomorphism between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{A}_\infty/\langle\tau^r\rangle$ and identify them. Let W be an indecomposable module in $\mathcal{C}$. If W lies in the position $(a, b + r\mathbb{Z})$ in $\mathcal{C}$, then the cone $\mathsf{Cone}\, W$ is defined as the set of indecomposable modules in $\mathcal{C}$ located in

$$\{(c, b + d + r\mathbb{Z}) \mid c \in \{1, 2, \dots, a\},\ d \in \{0, 1, \dots, a - c\}\}.$$

For example, if $a = 3$, this set can be pictured as follows;



Now let $V_1, \ldots, V_p$ be the distinct elements of $\mathsf{ind}_H V$. They are indecomposable H-modules in $\mathcal{C}$. By [SimS, 1.7. Lemma], if $i \neq j$, then $\mathsf{Cone}\, V_i \subsetneq \mathsf{Cone}\, V_j$ or $\mathsf{Cone}\, V_i \supsetneq \mathsf{Cone}\, V_j$ or $\mathsf{Cone}\, V_i \cap \mathsf{Cone}\, V_j = \emptyset$ holds. Thus we may assume that for $j = 2, \ldots, p$, $\mathsf{Cone}\, V_1 \supsetneq \mathsf{Cone}\, V_j$ or $\mathsf{Cone}\, V_1 \cap \mathsf{Cone}\, V_j = \emptyset$ holds.

We define an idempotent $e \in A$ as $U \oplus V \to V \to U \oplus V$. Since $\mathsf{Hom}_H(V, U) = 0$, we have $A/\langle e\rangle \cong \mathsf{End}_H(U)$ as K-algebras. By [SimS, 2.3. Theorem] (c), the indecomposable A-modules in $\mathsf{Hom}_H(U, \mathcal{C} \cap \mathsf{Fac}_H T \cap V^{\perp})$ forms a standard stable tube $\mathcal{C}'$ in the Auslander–Reiten quiver of $\mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle$, where $V^{\perp} = \{W \in \mathsf{mod}\, H \mid \mathsf{Hom}_H(V, W) = 0\}$. Let $M_1, \ldots, M_m$ be the distinct $A/\langle e\rangle$-modules in the mouth of the stable tube $\mathcal{C}'$.

In this setting, $P_1 := \mathsf{Hom}_H(T, V_1)$ is a projective A-module. If V_1 is located on $(a, b + r\mathbb{Z})$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we set a module W_1 so that it corresponds to the point $(a + 1, b - 1 + r\mathbb{Z})$. Then it is shown that $\mathsf{rad}_A P_1 \cong \mathsf{Hom}_H(T, W_1)$ and that $\mathsf{rad}_A P_1$ can be regarded as an indecomposable $A/\langle e\rangle$-module in the mouth of $\mathcal{C}'$, see the proof of [SimS, 2.3. Theorem] ($\mathsf{rad}_A P_1$ is F_1 there). We may assume that $M_1 = \mathsf{rad}_A P_1$.

Now we show the set $\mathcal{S} := \{P_1, M_2, \ldots, M_m\}$ is a semibrick in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. First, $M_2, \ldots, M_m$ are pairwise orthogonal bricks by a property of standard stable tubes. Next, $\mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i, P_1) \cong \mathsf{Hom}_A(M_i, M_1) = 0$ holds for $i = 2, \ldots, m$, because P_1 is projective and because $\mathsf{rad}_A P_1 = M_1$. We also have $\mathsf{Hom}_A(P_1, M_i) = 0$, since M_i is an $A/\langle e\rangle$-module. Finally, V_1 satisfies $\mathsf{Ext}^1_H(V_1, V_1) = 0$, and hence V_1 is a brick in $\mathsf{mod}\, H$ [SimS, 1.6. Lemma], so P_1 is a brick in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{S} \in \mathsf{sbrick}\, A$. We can consider a wide subcategory $\mathcal{W} = \mathsf{Filt}_A \mathcal{S}$.

We prove that $\mathcal{W} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$. It is easily seen that $\mathcal{W} = \mathsf{add}_A P_1 * \mathsf{Filt}_A(M_2, \ldots, M_m)$, since P_1 is projective. By construction, a wide subcategory $\mathsf{Filt}_A(M_2, \ldots, M_m)$ is in $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A/\langle e\rangle$, because $M_2, \ldots, M_m$ are $A/\langle e\rangle$-modules in the mouth of $\mathcal{C}'$ and because there also exists M_1 in the mouth. Therefore, we also have $\mathsf{Filt}_A(M_2, \ldots, M_m) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$. On the other hand, $\mathsf{add}_A P_1$ is obviously functorially finite in $\mathsf{mod}\, A$. Thus we get $\mathcal{W} \in \mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A$.

We finally prove $\mathcal{W} \notin \mathsf{f_R\text{-}wide}\, A$, or equivalently, $\mathsf{F}_A(\mathcal{W}) \notin \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$. We assume that $\mathsf{F}_A(\mathcal{W}) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$, and deduce a contradiction. This assumption implies that $\mathsf{F}_A(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle$ is functorially finite in $\mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle$. The bricks $M_2, \ldots, M_m$ already belong to $\mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle$, and $M_1 = \mathsf{rad}_A P_1$ is a maximal A-submodule of P_1 in $\mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle$. Therefore, we have $\mathsf{F}_A(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathsf{mod}\, A/\langle e\rangle = \mathsf{F}_A(M_1, \ldots, M_m) \in \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A/\langle e\rangle$ and hence a wide subcategory $\mathsf{Filt}_A(M_1, \ldots, M_m)$ must belong to $\mathsf{f\text{-}wide}\, A/\langle e\rangle$ by Proposition 4.3 (2). But this is false, because $M_1, \ldots, M_m$ are all of the $A/\langle e\rangle$-modules in the mouth of the stable tube $\mathcal{C}'$. Thus we obtain $\mathsf{F}_A(\mathcal{W}) \notin \mathsf{f\text{-}torf}\, A$.

The proof has been completed. □

References

[AIR] T. Adachi, O. Iyama, I. Reiten, *τ-tilting theory*, Compos. Math. 150 (2014), no. 3, 415–452.

[AS1] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalø, *Preprojective modules over artin algebras*, J. Algebra 66 (1980), no. 1, 61–122.

[AS2] M. Auslander, S. O. Smalø, *Almost split sequences in subcategories*, J. Algebra 69 (1981), no. 2, 426–454.

[BBD] A. A. Beĭlinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers* (French), Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981), 5–171, Astérisque, 100, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982.

[BY] T. Brüstle, D. Yang, *Ordered exchange graphs*, Advances in representation theory of algebras, 135–193, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2013.

[DIJ] L. Demonet, O. Iyama, G. Jasso, *τ-tilting finite algebras, g-vectors and brick–τ-rigid correspondence*, arXiv:1503.00285v5.

[Gab1] P. Gabriel, *Des catégories abéliennes* (French), Bull. Soc. Math. France 90, 1962, 323–448.

[Gab2] P. Gabriel, *Indecomposable representations. II*, Symposia Mathematica, Vol. XI (Convegno di Algebra Commutativa, INDAM, Rome, 1971), pp. 81–104, Academic Press, London, 1973.

[GL] W. Geigle, H. Lenzing, *Perpendicular categories with applications to representations and sheaves*, J. Algebra 144 (1991), no. 2, 273–343.

[IT] C. Ingalls, H. Thomas, *Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers*, Compos. Math. 145 (2009), no. 6, 1533–1562.

[IRRT] O. Iyama, N. Reading, I. Reiten, H. Thomas, *Lattice structure of Weyl groups via representation theory of preprojective algebras*, arXiv:1604.08401v1.

[KY] S. Koenig, D. Yang, *Silting objects, simple-minded collections, t-structures and co-t-structures for finite-dimensional algebras*, Doc. Math. 19 (2014), 403–438.

[MS] F. Marks, J. Šťovíček, *Torsion classes, wide subcategories and localisations*, arXiv:1503.04639v1.

[Miz] Y. Mizuno, *Classifying τ-tilting modules over preprojective algebras of Dynkin type*, Math. Z. 277 (2014), no. 3-4, 665–690.

[Rin] C. M. Ringel, *Representations of K-species and bimodules*, J. Algebra 41 (1976), no. 2, 269–302.

[Sch] A. H. Schofield, *Representation of rings over skew fields*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 92, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

[SikS] S. A. Sikko, S. O. Smalø, *Extensions of homologically finite subcategories*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 60 (1993), no. 6, 517–526.

[SimS] D. Simson, A. Skowroński, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras, Vol. 3: Representation-infinite tilted algebras*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 72. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[Sma] S. O. Smalø, *Torsion theories and tilting modules*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 16 (1984), no. 5, 518–522.

[Ste] Bo. Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 217, An introduction to methods of ring theory. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975.

Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya-shi, Aichi-ken, 464-8602, Japan

E-mail address: m14001v@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp